


82-1972

No.



In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1982

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Petitioner.*

vs.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and LAWRENCE CORNELL

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE  
STATE OF KANSAS**

WILLIAM H. PICKETT

*Counsel of Record*

WILLIAM H. PICKETT, P.C.

1413 Traders Bank Building  
1125 Grand Avenue  
Kansas City, Missouri 64106  
(816) 221-4343

and

MICHAEL E. CALLEN

CALLEN, SEXTON, RAJALA & SHELOR

410 Security National Bank Bldg.  
707 Minnesota Avenue  
Kansas City, Kansas 66101  
(913) 621-0202

*Attorneys for Petitioner*

## **QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas deprived petitioner of property without due process of law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, by ordering a remittitur of the verdict in favor of petitioner or in the alternative granting a new trial.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Opinions Below .....                                   | 1   |
| Jurisdiction .....                                     | 1   |
| Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved ..... | 2   |
| Statement .....  | 3   |
| Reasons for Granting the Petition .....                | 6   |
| Conclusion .....                                       | 11  |
| Appendix A .....                                       | A1  |
| Appendix B .....                                       | A3  |
| Appendix C .....                                       | A8  |
| Appendix D .....                                       | A16 |
| Appendix E .....                                       | A17 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>American R. Express Co. v. Levee</i> , 263 U.S. 19, 44 S.Ct. 11, 68 L.Ed. 140 (1923) ..... | 7 |
| <i>Andrews v. Virginia R. Co.</i> , 248 U.S. 272, 39 S.Ct. 101, 63 L.Ed. 236 (1919) .....     | 6 |
| <i>Bacon v. Texas</i> , 163 U.S. 207, 16 S.Ct. 1023, 41 L.Ed. 132 (1896) .....                | 7 |
| <i>Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth</i> , 408 U.S. 564, 92 S.Ct. 2701 (1972) .....  | 8 |
| <i>Boddie v. Connecticut</i> , 401 U.S. 371, 91 S.Ct. 780 (1971) .....                        | 7 |
| <i>Carey v. Piphus</i> , 435 U.S. 247, 98 S.Ct. 1042 (1978) ....                              | 8 |
| <i>Cohen v. California</i> , 403 U.S. 15, 91 S.Ct. 1780, 29 L.Ed. 2d 284 (1971) .....         | 7 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Gallick v. Baltimore &amp; O. R. Co.</i> , 372 U.S. 108, 83 S.Ct. 659, 9 L.Ed.2d 618 (1963) .....                    | 6  |
| <i>Harrison v. Missouri P. R. Co.</i> , 372 U.S. 248, 83 S.Ct. 690, 9 L.Ed.2d 711 (1963) .....                          | 6  |
| <i>Herbel v. Endres</i> , 202 Kan. 733, 451 P.2d 184 (1969) .....   | 9  |
| <i>Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. Dallas</i> , 390 U.S. 676, 88 S.Ct. 1298, 20 L.Ed.2d 225 (1968) .....                    | 7  |
| <i>Landscape Development Company v. Kansas City Power &amp; Light Company</i> , 197 Kan. 126, 415 P.2d 398 (1966) ..... | 9  |
| <i>Lassiter v. Department of Soc. Serv. of Durham Cty.</i> , 101 S.Ct. 2153 (1981) .....                                | 8  |
| <i>Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Company</i> , 102 S.Ct. 1148 (1982) .....   | 7  |
| <i>Mellon v. O'Neil</i> , 275 U.S. 212, 48 S.Ct. 62, 72 L.Ed. 245 (1927) .....  | 7  |
| <i>Mettee v. Urban Renewal Agency</i> , 219 Kan. 165, 557 P.2d 356 (1976) .....   | 9  |
| <i>Parratt v. Taylor</i> , 101 S.Ct. 1908 (1981) .....  | 7  |
| <i>Slocum v. Kansas Power and Light Company</i> , 190 Kan. 747, 378 P.2d 51 (1963) .....                                | 10 |
| <i>Vachon v. New Hampshire</i> , 441 U.S. 478, 94 S.Ct. 664, 38 L.Ed.2d 666 (1974) .....                                | 6  |
| <i>Webb v. Webb</i> , 101 S.Ct. 1889 (1981) .....   | 6  |
| <i>Wood v. Georgia</i> , 101 S.Ct. 1097, 67 L.Ed.2d 220 (1981) .....  | 6  |

### Constitutional Provisions

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Article One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution .....        | 2        |
| Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution ..... | 6, 7, 11 |

**Statutes**

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) .....       | 1, 6 |
| Kan. Stat. Ann. 60-259(a) ..... | 2, 9 |
| Kan. Stat. Ann. 60-259 .....    | 4    |

**Miscellaneous**

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Annot., 29 L.Ed.2d 872 (1972) ..... | 6 |
| Annot., 61 L.Ed.2d 944 (1980) ..... | 7 |

No.

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

**October Term, 1982**

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Petitioner,*

vs.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and LAWRENCE CORNELL

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE  
STATE OF KANSAS**

William H. Pickett, on behalf of Mark Hochanadel, petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals of the State of Kansas in this case.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

The opinion of the Court of Appeals of Kansas dated December 30, 1982 (App. A, *infra*, A1-A2), is not reported. The opinion of the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas, dated October 29, 1981 (App. B, *infra*, A3-A7), is not reported. The opinion of the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas, dated December 11, 1981 (App. C, *infra*, A8-A15), is not reported.

**JURISDICTION**

The judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas (App. A, *infra*, A1-A2) was entered on December 30, 1982. A Motion for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc before the Court of Appeals of Kansas was denied on January 19, 1983 (App. D, *infra*, A16). On March 8, 1983 a Petition for Review in the Supreme Court of Kansas was denied (App. E, *infra*, A17). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. Article One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in relevant part:

No State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

2. Kansas Statutes Annotated 60-259(a) provides in pertinent part:

A new trial may be granted to all or any of the parties and on all or part of the issues when it appears that the rights of the party are substantially affected:

*First.* Because of abuse of discretion of the court, misconduct of the jury or party, or action or surprise which ordinary prudence could not have guarded against, or for any other cause whereby the party was not afforded a reasonable opportunity to present his evidence and be heard on the merits of the case.

*Second.* Erroneous rulings or instructions of the Court.

*Third.* That the verdict, report or decision was given under the influence of passion or prejudice.

*Fourth.* That the verdict, report or decision is in whole or in part contrary to the evidence.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. In July, 1981 a jury trial was had on petitioner's personal injury action against the two respondents, Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc., in the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas. Following that trial the jury returned a unanimous verdict in favor of petitioner against both respondents. The jury assessed petitioner's net recovery against the two respondents at Eight Hundred Fifty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$855,000.00). On July 24, 1981 the district court entered judgment on that verdict (App. C, *infra*, A8-A9).

2. Subsequently, respondents made a Motion for a New Trial or, in the Alternative, Motion for Remittitur. Such Motion was argued on August 17, 1981, and on October 29, 1981 the district court, by memorandum decision, ordered a remittitur of the verdict to Three Hundred Sixty-Seven Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty-Eight Dollars and 50/100 (\$367,888.50). The district court cited, as the basis for the remittitur ordered, *its feeling* that the verdict was outside the range of the evidence (App. B, *infra*, A3-A7).

3. On November 12, 1981 respondents moved to modify the district court's memorandum decision of October 29, 1981 to reflect an alternative order for new trial if petitioner rejected the remittitur. Petitioner then moved to strike respondents' motion to modify, and to reinstate the verdict. Such motions were argued on November 18, 1981 and at that hearing petitioner argued that the district court deprived him of property without due process of law by improperly ordering the remittitur. On November 20, 1981 the district court issued another order granting respondents a new trial in the event petitioner rejected the remittitur, and finding that the jury was influenced by passion and prejudice. Thereafter, on December 11, 1981

the district court filed its Journal Entry of Judgment reflecting that order of November 20, 1981 (App. C, infra, A8-A15).

4. On November 25, 1981 petitioner filed his original Notice of Appeal in the Court of Appeals of Kansas. Respondents filed their Notice of Cross Appeal on December 11, 1981. Petitioner's refusal to accept a remittitur was filed on December 21, 1981, as was petitioner's Amended Notice of Appeal in the Court of Appeals of Kansas. The district court then ordered a new trial.

5. On appeal, petitioner contended that the district court was without jurisdiction to enter its order directing a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial, in that the district court failed to comply with the substantive requirements of Kansas law, namely Kan. Stat. Ann. 60-259 (quoted above) as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Kansas. The Court of Appeals of Kansas, on December 30, 1982, dismissed petitioner's appeal on the ground that the district court's order complied with Kansas law, was within its jurisdiction, and was not appealable as of right (App. A, infra, A1-A2).

6. Subsequently, on January 10, 1983 petitioner submitted a Motion for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc before the Court of Appeals of Kansas. That Motion was denied on January 19, 1983 (App. D, infra, A16). On January 31, 1983 petitioner filed a Petition for Review in the Supreme Court of Kansas, requesting that Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals of Kansas rendered on December 30, 1982. That Petition for Review was denied on March 8, 1983 (App. E, infra, A17).

7. The federal question sought to be reviewed here was raised in the court of first instance (the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas) on November 18, 1981 at

the hearing on respondents' motion to modify the district court's order directing a remittitur. At that hearing counsel for petitioner argued that the district court committed gross error, in deprivation of petitioner's due process, by ordering the remittitur. Counsel for petitioner also argued that the district court was clearly taking property without due process by ordering the remittitur, and that the district court's actions consisted of taking without due process the property that petitioner has been awarded. Counsel for petitioner asserted that the district court's order had constitutionally abdicated petitioner's right in the jury verdict. The district court rejected petitioner's argument and on November 20, 1981 issued another order granting respondents a new trial in the event petitioner rejected the remittitur, and finding that the jury was influenced by passion and prejudice (App. C, *infra*, A8-A15).

8. Although this federal constitutional question was not explicitly raised in the appellate courts of Kansas, both the Court of Appeals of Kansas and the Supreme Court of Kansas implicitly ruled upon such issue by their dismissal of petitioner's appeal and denial of review of that dismissal. Even if petitioner failed to raise his federal constitutional challenge in the Kansas courts, this Court has jurisdiction to review plain error unchallenged in the state court to prevent fundamental unfairness, as exists here.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case presents an important question concerning a state court's power to modify a jury verdict and judgment thereon. The decision below essentially affirms a district court order entered without jurisdiction, and conflicts with the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The federal question has been decided in a way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court.

1. Initially, this Court has jurisdiction to review the plain error of the Kansas courts which may have been inadequately challenged in those courts, because of the fundamental unfairness of the Kansas courts' decisions. *See Webb v. Webb*, 101 S.Ct. 1889, 1895 (1981), *Wood v. Georgia*, 101 S.Ct. 1097, 1100 n.5, 67 L.Ed.2d 220 (1981), and *Vachon v. New Hampshire*, 441 U.S. 478, 94 S.Ct. 664, 38 L.Ed.2d 666 (1974).
2. It is important to note that the Supreme Court of Kansas' refusal to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas in this cause makes the judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas the final judgment for purposes of review by the Supreme Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3). Annot., 29 L.Ed.2d 872, 877 (1972). *Gallick v. Baltimore & O. R. Co.*, 372 U.S. 108, 83 S.Ct. 659, 9 L.Ed.2d 618 (1963). *Harrison v. Missouri P. R. Co.*, 372 U.S. 248, 83 S.Ct. 690, 9 L.Ed.2d 711 (1963). *Andrews v. Virginia R. Co.*, 248 U.S. 272, 39 S.Ct. 101, 63 L.Ed. 236 (1919).
3. For the purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) the judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas in this cause is also the judgment of the highest court of the State of Kansas in which a decision in the suit could be had. This results from the Supreme Court of Kansas' denial of the

petition for review of the Court of Appeals of Kansas' judgment. Annot., 61 L.Ed.2d 944, 948 (1980). *Bacon v. Texas*, 163 U.S. 207, 16 S.Ct. 1023, 41 L.Ed. 132 (1896). *American R. Express Co. v. Levee*, 263 U.S. 19, 44 S.Ct. 11, 68 L.Ed. 140 (1923). *Mellon v. O'Neil*, 275 U.S. 212, 48 S.Ct. 62, 72 L.Ed. 245 (1927). *Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. Dallas*, 390 U.S. 676, 88 S.Ct. 1298, 20 L.Ed.2d 225 (1968). *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15, 91 S.Ct. 1780, 29 L.Ed.2d 284 (1971).

4. Due process requires, at a minimum, that absent a countervailing state interest of over-riding significance, persons forced to settle their claims of right and duty through the judicial process must be given a *meaningful opportunity to be heard*. *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371, 378, 91 S.Ct. 780, 785 (1971). The hallmark of "property" under the 14th Amendment's Due Process Clause is an individual entitlement grounded in state law, which cannot be removed except "for cause"; "[o]nce that characteristic is found, the types of interest protected as 'property' are varied and, as often as not, intangible, relating 'to the whole domain of social and economic fact.'" *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Company*, 102 S.Ct. 1148, 1155 (1982). "[T]he Due Process Clause grants the aggrieved party the opportunity to present his case and have its merits *fairly judged*." *Id.* at 1156 (emphasis added). The fundamental requirement of due process is an opportunity to be heard, and it is an opportunity which must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner. *Parrott v. Taylor*, 101 S.Ct. 1908, 1915 (1981).

5. This Court has recognized that due process has never been, and perhaps can never be, precisely defined. It is not a technical conception with fixed content unrelated to time, place and circumstances. Due process expresses the requirement of fundamental fairness. Applying the Due Process Clause is an uncertain enterprise which must

discover what fundamental fairness consists of in a particular situation by first considering any relevant precedent and then by assessing the several interests at stake. *Las-siter v. Department of Soc. Serv. of Durham Cty.*, 101 S.Ct. 2153, 2158 (1981). "Procedural due process rules are meant to protect persons not from the deprivation, but from the mistaken or unjustified deprivation of life, liberty or property." *Carey v. Piphus*, 435 U.S. 247, 260, 98 S.Ct. 1042, 1050 (1978).

Property interests protected by procedural due process extend well beyond actual ownership of real estate, chattels or money. *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 572-73, 92 S.Ct. 2701, 2706 (1972). "Property interests, of course, are not created by the Constitution. Rather they are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules or understandings that stem from an independent source such as state law—rules or understandings that secure certain benefits and that support claims of entitlement to those benefits." *Id.* at 578, 2709.

6. In this case, the Kansas courts deprived petitioner of a meaningful opportunity to be heard on his personal injury action against respondents. Those courts denied him the opportunity to present his case and have its merits fairly judged. His opportunity to be heard was not granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner. Fundamental fairness was denied petitioner. The Kansas courts mistakenly and unjustifiably deprived petitioner of a property right, in clear violation of Kansas law.

7. It is clear that the Kansas courts have deprived the petitioner of property without due process of law, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Petitioner had a property right in the jury verdict, and judgment entered thereon on July 24, 1981, in the amount of Eight Hundred Fifty-Five Thou-

sand Dollars (\$855,000.00). The district court deprived petitioner of such property right in the jury verdict and judgment thereon without due process of law by ordering a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial while lacking jurisdiction to do so, and also by acting unreasonably, arbitrarily and capriciously in entering such order.

The district court was without jurisdiction to enter its order of November 20, 1981 granting respondents a new trial if petitioner did not accept a remittitur. Such order was based on the district court's finding that the verdict was outside the range of evidence and the result of passion and prejudice (App. C, *infra*, A8-A15).

K.S.A. 60-259(a), quoted above, states the exclusive grounds for which a new trial may be granted in Kansas. *Mettee v. Urban Renewal Agency*, 219 Kan. 165, 167-68, 557 P.2d 356, 358 (1976); *Herbel v. Endres*, 202 Kan. 733, 736, 451 P.2d 184, 187-88 (1969); *Landscape Development Company v. Kansas City Power & Light Company*, 197 Kan. 126, 132-33, 415 P.2d 398, 404 (1966). One ground is that the verdict was given under the influence of passion or prejudice and another is that the verdict is contrary to the evidence. The Supreme Court of Kansas has held that a court must set forth with specificity its reasons in support of the statutory grounds of K.S.A. 60-259(a), and has no jurisdiction to grant a new trial or order a remittitur simply because it is dissatisfied with the verdict. *Mettee v. Urban Renewal Agency*, *cited above*.

The district court's bald statements that the verdict was outside the range of evidence and based on passion and prejudice are totally unsupported by specific reasons and substance as required by Kansas law. The district court's finding that the verdict was based on passion and prejudice was first made in its Journal Entry of Judgment dated December 11, 1981 (App. C, *infra*, A8-A15). The

district court's original memorandum of decision, dated October 29, 1981 (App. B, infra, A3-A7) states only that the district court feels that the verdict is outside the range of evidence. The later finding of passion and prejudice was made at the urging of respondents to support the district court's order of remittitur or new trial, and to reflect the well-settled principle that a district court cannot order a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial simply where it disagrees with the jury's findings and the verdict is supported by the evidence.

The record shows that the district court had no substantive support for its finding that the verdict was based on passion and prejudice, and was outside the range of evidence. The verdict was supported by expert testimony (See App. B, infra, A6). Specific grounds for the finding of passion and prejudice are absent. Even if the district court believed the verdict was rendered under the influence of passion and prejudice, it then had a duty to enter an order granting respondents a new trial and not a remittitur. *Slocum v. Kansas Power and Light Company*, 190 Kan. 747, 378 P.2d 51 (1963). The district court's order of remittitur or in the alternative a new trial contradicts its findings, the evidence, and Kansas law.

As a result the district court was clearly without jurisdiction to enter its order of November 20, 1981, ordering petitioner to accept a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial. Such order was entered simply because the district court was dissatisfied with the verdict, and is arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious.

8. It is evident, therefore, that the district court and the Court of Appeals of Kansas denied petitioner a meaningful opportunity to be heard. Petitioner was denied the opportunity to present his case and have its merits fairly judged. Petitioner was denied the fundamental

requirement of due process which is an opportunity to be heard, and an opportunity which must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner. The due process requirement of fundamental fairness has been denied petitioner. Petitioner in this case was mistakenly and unjustifiedly deprived of his property right in the jury verdict and judgment thereon in violation of due process rules.

### **CONCLUSION**

The decision below is palpably erroneous, and clearly evinces Kansas' violation of petitioner's due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Petitioner has exhausted his remedies in the Kansas courts. The present petition for a writ of certiorari should therefore be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM H. PICKETT

*Counsel of Record*

WILLIAM H. PICKETT, P.C.

1413 Traders Bank Building

1125 Grand Avenue

Kansas City, Missouri 64106

(816) 221-4343

and

MICHAEL E. CALLEN

CALLEN, SEXTON, RAJALA & SHELOR

410 Security National Bank Bldg.

707 Minnesota Avenue

Kansas City, Kansas 66101

(913) 621-0202

*Attorneys for Petitioner*

**APPENDIX**

---

**APPENDIX A**

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

No. 54,005

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Appellant,*

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE CORNELL,  
*Appellees.*

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

(Filed December 30, 1982)

Appeal from Wyandotte District Court; CORDELL D. MEEKS, JR., judge. Opinion filed December 30, 1982. Appeal dismissed.

*Michael E. Callen*, of Barnett & Lerner, of Overland Park, and *William H. Pickett*, of William H. Pickett, P. C., of Kansas City, Missouri, for the appellant.

*Edward M. Boddington, Jr.*, of Boddington & Brown, of Kansas City, for the appellees.

Before SPENCER, P.J., PARKS, J., and HARRY G. MILLER, District Judge Retired, Assigned.

PARKS, J.: After trial of this case, the district court granted the defendants' motion for remittitur or new trial.

Plaintiff Mark Hochanadel rejected the offer of remittitur and appeals the order granting a new trial.

An order granting a new trial is generally not appealable as a final judgment unless the order is challenged on jurisdictional grounds. *Brown v. Fitzpatrick*, 224 Kan. 636, 638, 585 P.2d 987 (1978). The grant of a new trial is beyond the court's jurisdiction if it is granted upon grounds not enumerated in K.S.A. 60-259 (a). *Smith v. Morris*, 2 Kan.App.2d 59, 62, 574 P.2d 568 (1978).

In the present case, the trial court found that the jury's verdict was based on passion and prejudice and outside the range of the evidence. Such findings being grounds under K.S.A. 60-259 (a) *Third* and *Fourth* for a new trial, the decision of the trial court was within its jurisdiction and not appealable as of right.

Appeal dismissed.

**APPENDIX B**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF KANSAS

No. 78C1323

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Plaintiff,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE CORNELL,  
Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

(Filed on October 29, 1981)

Defendants' motion for new trial or in the alternative for remittitur was argued to the Court (sic) on August 17, 1981, at which time the matter was taken under advisement by the Court. The following is the Court's decision on those motions.

The first ground alleged by defendants for a new trial is that Instruction No. 16 is erroneous in that the Court failed to give grounds No. 2 and No. 3, that plaintiff failed to observe the near approach of the truck and that he failed to observe the moving truck when he knew or should have known that trucks were regularly being moved in lots such as that of the defendant. The evidence does not support the contention that plaintiff could have or should have known or observed the moving truck but to the contrary, that the whole thing happened so suddenly and at such a slow speed, no reasonable person would have had a duty to expect the truck to back into him, without stopping. Otherwise, pedestrians in all types of parking lots would be expected to exercise such a degree of caution as to require traffic signals. While it

is true plaintiff's experience required him to know that some vehicles in parking lots do move occasionally, the law does not require him to expect to be backed into, especially by a slow moving truck. The deletion of those two additional grounds in Instruction No. 16 does not prejudice the defendant in any way.

The second ground for a new trial alleged by defendants is that the Court erred in failing to admit defendants' instructions 17 through 20. These instructions dealing with plaintiff's burden to exercise a degree of care for his own safety are covered adequately in Instruction No. 22 which sets out the duties of a business visitor. The evidence simply did not support defendants requested Instructions 18, 19 or 20. Again, because of the circumstances surrounding the accident, plaintiff was not bound to observe objects he should have seen. No reasonable person could have seen the truck according to the evidence as it was presented. It was not properly an issue for the jury. Had plaintiff been accustomed to experiencing pedestrians getting hit by trucks in such parking lots perhaps defendants' instructions would have been proper. But there was no evidence to suggest plaintiff's experience extended that far. As was stated in Instruction No. 22, plaintiff "does not have a duty, however, to look for danger where there is no reason to apprehend any."

Defendants' third reason for requesting a new trial is that Instructions No. 25 and No. 26 were erroneous. Instruction No. 25 is a modification of P.I.K. 2d 8.03. The issue is whether it is an over broad modification. The Court is inclined to follow plaintiff's reasons for modifying this instruction and adopt them as its own. Neither Instruction prejudices the rights of the defendants and the Court feels that from all the evidence, the result of imposing liability on the defendants would have been the same with or without these instructions.

As to the amount of the verdict being excessive the Court is mindful that if the verdict is within the range of the evidence, the Court cannot substitute its judgment for that of the jury. *Metee v. Urban Renewal Agency*, 219 Kan 165. The verdict must be within the range of the evidence. Instruction No. 18 allowed the jury to consider "such amount of money as will reasonably compensate him for his injuries and losses" including pain, suffering, disabilities, accompanying mental anguish to date and in the future, reasonable expenses of necessary medical care, hospitalization now and in the future and loss of time or income now and in the future. The jurors were further instructed that there is no mathematical formula for such items as pain, suffering, disability and mental anguish. The amount to be awarded was left to the sound discretion of the jury. Instruction No. 19 allowed a sum for loss and impairment of plaintiff's ability to perform services as a husband to his wife, such things as domestic and household duties, companionship, aid, assistance, comfort and society to his wife. Instruction No. 20 said life expectancy tables indicate plaintiff would live another 35.6 years.

The most difficult task in trying to decide a remittitur motion is separating the issue of liability from determining amount. There is no question that defendants have now been found to be responsible and their percentage of fault is no longer at issue. There is still a great compulsion to look at the evidence and try to determine that this was not really a very serious accident. There are no allegations of gross negligence or even injuries that would shock the conscience of the Court. The jury has decided that a man who was slightly touched by a truck and who never realized his injuries until almost two years later, injuries that admittedly could have been caused by any number of things, was injured in fact

due to that slight accident. Plaintiff did a remarkable job of showing causation or probable cause. However, that is not to be taken into account in a motion for remittitur. The one issue is whether the jury somehow abused their privilege of using sound discretion in light of the evidence presented.

Certainly, there is no question about the reasonableness of medical care and expenses of a few thousand dollars. The evidence clearly justified these expenses. The question is whether all those intangible items remaining added up to \$950.000.00 (sic), reduced to \$855,000.00 by a 10% percentage of fault attributed to plaintiff. The fact that plaintiff's statement of monetary damages was \$4,000,000.00 does not aid the Court in making a decision. It is not uncommon for such demands to be exorbitant to sway settlement negotiations.

The only place where there is mention of large sums of money is in plaintiff's exhibit 85. That exhibit suggests that plaintiff's total loss of wages, bonuses, and household services could range from \$378,765 to \$1,725,686 depending on whether plaintiff was considered severely or occupationally disabled. Severe meant unable to work altogether or unable to work regularly. Occupationally disabled meant able to work regularly, but unable to do the same work as before the onset of disability or unable to work full-time.

According to plaintiff's exhibits 28, 29 and 30, which are income tax returns for the years surrounding the accident date of April 26, 1978, plaintiff earned some \$38,000 in 1977, \$38,000 in 1978, \$42,000 in 1979, and \$35,000 in 1980. He was working for the same employer, Kenworth Sales and Service. This evidence along with testimony of plaintiff would indicate he suffered only an occupational disability. With wage increases at historic

national rates for experienced managers; plaintiff's loss of wages, bonuses and household services would not exceed for the pretrial and post-trial periods, \$378,765.00.

It is the Court's feeling that the jury may have become confused by plaintiff's exhibit 85 and rendered its verdict based on incorrect figures. Defendant has not really given the Court anything to go on in its request for a remittitur except a blanket statement that the verdict was so excessive as to shock the conscience of the Court. But, the Court has researched the record of the trial on its own because the Court's conscience was at least stirred by the size of the verdict, and the Court was curious as for the reason.

After reviewing the record and recalling the evidence, the Court feels the original verdict is outside the range of the evidence. The Court feels a more appropriate verdict would have been \$378,765 for loss of wages, bonuses and household services, \$10,000 for medicals and \$20,000 for pain and suffering for a total of \$408,765.00 and reduced by 10% for a net total of \$367,888.50.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.  
Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.

Judge of the District Court  
Division No. Six

**APPENDIX C**

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF WYANDOTTE  
COUNTY, KANSAS  
CIVIL COURT DEPARTMENT

No. 78-C-1323

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Plaintiff,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE R. CORNELL,  
Defendants.

**JOURNAL ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

(Filed December 11, 1981)

Now, on this 24th day of July 1981, comes on for hearing before a jury plaintiff Mark Hochanadel's claim for damages against defendant Detco Trailer, Inc., and defendant Lawrence R. Cornell. The plaintiff appears by William H. Pickett, Paul L. Redfearn, III, and Michael E. Callen, his attorneys of record; the defendants appear by Edward M. Boddington, Jr., and Kenneth E. Holm, their attorneys of record. Thereupon, the cause proceeds to trial from day to day.

The jury, having heard the evidence and instructed on the law, unanimously finds plaintiff Mark Hochanadel to have suffered damages in the amount of Nine Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$950,000.00) as a result of the occurrence, with defendant Detco Trailer, Inc., 75% at fault for the occurrence; defendant Lawrence R. Cornell 15% at fault for the occurrence; and plaintiff Mark Hochanadel 10% at fault for the occurrence. Upon the unanimous jury verdict, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that judgment be entered on this 24th day of July, 1981, in favor of plaintiff Mark Hochanadel and against defendant Detco Trailer, Inc., in the amount of Seven Hundred Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$712,500.00), and it is further

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that judgment be entered on this 24th day of July, 1981, in favor of plaintiff Mark Hochanadel and against defendant Lawrence R. Cornell in the amount of One Hundred Forty Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$142,500.00).

Defendant's Motion for New Trial or, in the Alternative, for Remittitur, was argued to the Court on August 17, 1981, at which time the matter was taken under advisement by the Court. On October 29, 1981, the Court rendered its decision on the defendants' motions, as follows:

The first ground alleged by defendants for a new trial is that Instruction No. 16 is erroneous in that the Court failed to give grounds No. 2 and No. 3, that plaintiff failed to observe the near approach of the truck and that he failed to observe the moving truck when he knew, or should have known, that trucks were regularly being moved in lots such as that of the defendant. The evidence does not support the contention that plaintiff could have, or should have known, or observed the moving truck, but, to the contrary, that the whole thing happened so suddenly and at such a slow speed, no reasonable person would have had a duty to expect the truck to back into him, without stopping. Otherwise, pedestrians in all types of parking lots would be expected to exercise such a degree of caution as to require traffic signals. While it is true plaintiff's experience required him to know that some vehicles in parking lots do move occasionally, the

law does not require him to expect to be backed into, especially by a slow moving truck. The deletion of those two additional grounds in Instruction No. 16 does not prejudice the defendant in any way.

The second ground for a new trial alleged by defendants is that the Court erred in failing to admit defendants' Instructions No. 17 through No. 20. These instructions, dealing with plaintiff's burden to exercise a degree of care for his own safety, are covered adequately in Instruction No. 22, which sets out the duties of a business visitor. The evidence simply did not support defendants' requested Instructions No. 18, 19 or 20. Again, because of the circumstances surrounding the accident, plaintiff was not bound to observe objects he should have seen. No reasonable person could have seen the truck according to the evidence as it was presented. It was not properly an issue for the jury. Had plaintiff been accustomed to experiencing pedestrians getting hit by trucks in such parking lots, perhaps defendants' Instructions would have been proper. But there was no evidence to suggest plaintiff's experience extended that far. As was stated in Instruction No. 22, plaintiff "does not have a duty, however, to look for danger where there is no reason to apprehend any."

Defendants' third reason for requesting a new trial is that Instructions No. 25 and 26 were erroneous. Instruction No. 25 is a modification of P.I.K. 2d 8.03. The issue is whether it is an overly broad modification. The Court is inclined to follow plaintiff's reasons for modifying this Instruction and adopt them as its own. Neither Instruction prejudices the rights of the defendants and the Court feels that from all the evidence, the result of imposing liability on the defendants would have been the same with or without these Instructions.

As to the amount of the verdict being excessive, the Court is mindful that if the verdict is within the range of the evidence, the Court cannot substitute its judgment for that of the jury. *Metee v. Urban Renewal Agency*, 219 Kan. 165. The verdict must be within the range of the evidence. Instruction No. 18 allowed the jury to consider "such amount of money as will reasonably compensate him for his injuries and losses", including pain, suffering, disabilities, accompanying mental anguish to date and in the future, reasonable expenses of necessary medical care, hospitalization now and in the future, and loss of time or income now and in the future. The jurors were further instructed that there is no mathematical formula for such items as pain, suffering, disability and mental anguish. The amount to be awarded was left to the sound discretion of the jury. Instruction No. 19 allowed a sum for loss and impairment of plaintiff's ability to perform services as a husband to his wife, such things as domestic and household duties, companionship, aid, assistance, comfort and society to his wife. Instruction No. 20 said life expectancy tables indicate plaintiff would live another 35.6 years.

The most difficult task in trying to decide a remittitur motion is separating the issue of liability from determining amount. There is no question that defendants have now been found to be responsible and their percentage of fault is no longer at issue. There is still a great compulsion to look at the evidence and try to determine that this was not really a very serious accident. There are no allegations of gross negligence or even injuries that would shock the conscience of the Court. The jury has decided that a man who was slightly touched by a truck and who never realized his injuries until almost two years later, injuries that admittedly could have been caused by any number of things, was injured, in fact,

due to that slight accident. Plaintiff did a remarkable job of showing causation or probable cause. However, that is not to be taken into account in a motion for remittitur. The one issue is whether the jury somehow abused their privilege of using sound discretion in light of the evidence presented.

Certainly, there is no question about the reasonableness of medical care and expenses of a few thousand dollars. The evidence clearly justified these expenses. The question is whether all those intangible items remaining added up to \$950,000.00, reduced to \$855,000.00 by a 10% percentage of fault attributed to the plaintiff. The fact that plaintiff's statement of monetary damages was \$4,000,000.00 does not aid the Court in making a decision. It is not uncommon for such demands to be exorbitant to sway settlement negotiations.

The only place where there is mention of large sums of money is in plaintiff's Exhibit 85. That exhibit suggests that plaintiff's total loss of wages, bonuses and household services could range from \$378,765.00 to \$1,725,686.00, depending on whether plaintiff was considered severely or occupationally disabled. "Severe" meant unable to work altogether or unable to work regularly. "Occupationally disabled" meant able to work regularly, but unable to do the same work as before the onset of disability or unable to work full-time.

According to plaintiff's Exhibits 28, 29 and 30, which are income tax returns for the years surrounding the accident date of April 26, 1978, plaintiff earned some \$38,000.00 in 1977; \$38,000.00 in 1978; \$42,000.00 in 1979; and \$35,000.00 in 1980.

He was working for the same employer, Kenworth Sales and Service. This evidence, along with testimony

of plaintiff, would indicate he suffered only an occupational disability. With wage increases at historic national rates for experienced managers, plaintiff's loss of wages, bonuses and household services would not exceed, for the pre-trial and post-trial periods, \$378,765.00.

It is the Court's feeling that the jury may have become confused by plaintiff's Exhibit 85 and rendered its verdict based on incorrect figures. Defendants have not really given the Court anything to go on in their request for a remittitur except a blanket statement that the verdict was so excessive as to shock the conscience of the Court. But, the Court has researched the record of the trial on its own because the Court's conscience was at least stirred by the size of the verdict, and the Court was curious as for the reason.

After reviewing the record and recalling the evidence, the Court feels the original verdict is outside the range of the evidence. The Court feels a more appropriate verdict would have been \$378,765.00 for loss of wages, bonuses and household services; \$10,000.00 for medicals; and \$20,000.00 for pain and suffering; for a total of \$408,765.00, and reduced by 10% for a net total of \$367,888.50.

And now, on this 18th day of November, 1981, comes on for hearing the defendants' Motion to Modify the Court's Memorandum Decision of October 29, 1981; plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendants' Motion to Modify, plaintiff's Motion to Eliminate Ten Percent Deduction by Jury of any causal responsibility of plaintiff, Mark Hochanadel, because the giving of Instruction No. 16 was plain error as is revealed by the Court's own comments in its Order dated October 29, 1981, relating to what would be expected of the plaintiff under the circumstances of the

accident, and plaintiff's Motion to Reinstate the Jury Verdict in the amount of \$950,000.00.

The parties appear as before and the Court, after hearing arguments of counsel from both sides, grants the defendants' Motions for Remittitur and Modification of the Court's Memorandum Decision of October 29, 1981, and denies the plaintiff's motions.

The Court further finds that the jury's verdict was based on passion and prejudice and shocked the conscience of the Court.

IT IS, THEREFORE, BY THE COURT ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that remittitur is hereby granted and that the judgment heretofore entered is reduced to the sum of \$367,888.50 and \$306,573.75 is assessed against defendant Detco Trailer, Inc., and \$61,314.75 is assessed against defendant Lawrence R. Cornell.

IT IS FURTHER BY THE COURT ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that the reduction in damages is upon the condition that the plaintiff accept or reject the reduced amount of damages, in writing, within ten days from the entry of this Order, by filing the acceptance or rejection with the Clerk of the District Court, or, on his failure to accept Remittitur within the allotted time, the defendants are granted a new trial on all issues because of the above findings of the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.  
The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.

Approved:

/s/ Paul L. Redfearn  
Paul L. Redfearn, III  
William H. Pickett, P. C.  
1413 Traders Bank Building  
1125 Grand - 816/221-4343  
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Barnett & Lerner  
By /s/ Michael E. Callen  
Michael E. Callen  
General Square Building - Suite 585  
9800 Metcalf Avenue - 913/381-7200  
Overland Park, Kansas 66212  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Boddington & Brown  
By /s/ Edw. M. Boddington, Jr.  
Edw. M. Boddington, Jr.  
Security National Bank Building  
Suite 100 - 913/371-1272  
7th and Minnesota Avenue  
Kansas City, Kansas 66101  
Attorneys for Defendants

**APPENDIX D**

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

No. 81-54005-A

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Appellant,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE R. CORNELL,  
Appellees.

**DENIAL OF APPELLANT'S MOTION  
FOR REHEARING**

(Filed January 19, 1983)

You are hereby notified of the following action taken  
in the above entitled case:

Appellant's motion for rehearing.

Denied.

Yours very truly,

Lewis C. Carter  
Clerk, Court of Appeals

Date Jan. 19, 1983

**APPENDIX E**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

No. 81-54005-A

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Appellant,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE R. CORNELL,  
Appellees.

**DENIAL OF PETITION FOR REVIEW**

(Filed March 8, 1983)

You are hereby notified of the following action taken  
in the above entitled case:

Petition for review.

Denied.

Yours very truly,

Lewis C. Carter  
Clerk, Supreme Court

Date March 8, 1983

JUN 27 1983

RECEIVED  
SPECIAL STEVENS  
PARK

No. 82-1972

In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1982

MARK HOCHANADEL,

*Petitioner,*

VS.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and LAWRENCE CORNELL,

*Respondents.*

RESPONDENTS' BRIEF TO WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF  
APPEALS OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

BODDINGTON & BROWN

KENNETH J. REILLY

Security National Bank Building

Suite 100

Minnesota at 7th Street

Kansas City, Kansas 66101

*Attorneys for Respondents*

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether there is a protectible property interest in an unaffirmed jury verdict sufficient to raise a federal question under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3).
2. Whether this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) to consider an asserted federal question not explicitly the subject of a final judgment by the Kansas Supreme Court where state proceedings are pending.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| OPINIONS BELOW .....                                   | 1  |
| JURISDICTION .....                                     | 2  |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED ..... | 2  |
| STATEMENT .....  | 4  |
| REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION .....                 | 5  |
| ARGUMENT .....   | 6  |
| CONCLUSION .....                                       | 12 |
| <br>APPENDIX—  |    |
| Appendix 1 .....                                       | A1 |
| Appendix 2 .....                                       | A2 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <i>Board of Greenwood County Commissioners v. Nadel</i> ,<br>228 Kan. 469, 618 P.2d 778 (1980) ..... | 7, 8 |
| <i>Board of Regents v. Roth</i> , 408 U.S. 564 (1972) .....  | 6, 9 |
| <i>Brown v. Fitzpatrick</i> , 224 Kan. 636, 585 P.2d 987 (1978) .....                                | 8    |
| <i>Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn</i> , 420 U.S. 469 (1975) ....                                     | 10   |
| <i>Gray v. Jenkins</i> , 183 Kan. 251, 326 P.2d 319 (1958) ....                                      | 11   |
| <i>Radio Station WOW, Inc. v. Johnson</i> , 326 U.S. 120<br>(1945) .....                             | 10   |
| <i>Webb's Fabulous Pharmacies, Inc. v. Beckwith</i> , 449 U.S.<br>155 (1980) .....                   | 6    |

### Constitutional Provisions

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| U. S. CONST. amend. XIV § 1 ..... | 2 |
|-----------------------------------|---|

### Statutes

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) (1976) .....         | 2, 3, 6, 11 |
| KAN. STAT. ANN. § 60-259(a) (1976) ..... | 3, 4, 6     |

No. 82-1972

In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1982

---

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Petitioner,*

vs.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and LAWRENCE CORNELL,  
*Respondents.*

---

**RESPONDENTS' BRIEF TO WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF  
APPEALS OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS**

---

**OPINIONS BELOW**

The opinion of the Court of Appeals of Kansas, dated December 30, 1982 (Petitioner's App. A, at A1-A2), is not reported. The opinion of the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas, dated October 29, 1981 (Petitioner's App. B, at A3-A7), is not reported. The opinion of the District Court of Wyandotte County, Kansas, dated December 11, 1981 (Petitioner's App. C, at A8-A15), is not reported.

## **JURISDICTION**

The judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas (Petitioner's App. A, at A1-A2) was entered on December 30, 1982. A Motion for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc before the Court of Appeals of Kansas was denied on January 19, 1983 (Petitioner's App. D, at A16). On March 8, 1983, a Petition for Review in the Supreme Court of Kansas was denied (Petitioner's App. E, at A17). The petitioner then sought a petition for a writ of mandamus. (Respondents' App. 1, at A1). This was denied by the Supreme Court of Kansas on June 3, 1983 (Respondents' App. 2, at A2). On June 6, 1983, the petition for certiorari was filed with this Court.

Petitioner predicates jurisdiction in this case on 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) (1976). The Court does not have jurisdiction of this pending state action under this provision for the reason that there has been no final judgment by the Kansas Supreme Court on any federal question. Moreover, the petition is directed improperly to the Court of Appeals of Kansas rather than to the state's highest court, the Kansas Supreme Court.

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

1. U.S. CONST. amend. XIV. § 1 provides in pertinent part:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

## 2. 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) (1976) provides:

Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court as follows:

\* \* \*

(3) By writ of certiorari, where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a State statute is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution, treaties or statutes of, or commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

## 3. KAN. STAT. ANN. § 60-259(a) (1976) provides in pertinent part:

A new trial may be granted to all or any of the parties and on all or part of the issues when it appears that the rights of the party are substantially affected:

\* \* \*

*Third.* That the verdict, report or decision was given under the influence of passion or prejudice.

*Fourth.* That the verdict, report or decision is in whole or in part contrary to the evidence.

\* \* \*

## STATEMENT

This is a personal injury action. Perhaps the best description of this case is the trial court's Journal Entry of Judgment:

The jury has decided that a man who was slightly touched by a truck and who never realized his injuries until almost two years later, injuries that admittedly could have been caused by any number of things, was injured, in fact, due to that slight accident. (Petitioner's App. C, at A11-17).

The jury awarded the plaintiff \$950,000 for this "slight injury" which was reduced to \$855,000 upon comparison of the plaintiff's fault in the accident (Petitioner's App. C, at A12). The trial court found this verdict to be based on passion and prejudice, and outside the range of evidence. The court ordered a remittitur to \$367,888 and ordered a conditional judgment on that amount, provided the plaintiff accept the reduced damages. In the alternative, the court ordered a new trial (Petitioner's App. C, at A14).

The petitioner failed to accept the reduced amount of damages and the trial court ordered a new trial. On appeal of that order, the Kansas Court of Appeals held that the order was not generally appealable as a final order unless challenged on jurisdictional grounds. The court also held that an order for a new trial is beyond a court's jurisdiction if it is granted on grounds not enumerated in KAN. STAT. ANN. § 60-259(a). The court held that the trial court's finding that the verdict was based on passion and prejudice and outside the range of evidence met the third and fourth enumerated grounds for a new trial under that statutory provision (Petitioner's App. A, at A2). Petitioner then appealed to the Supreme Court

of Kansas which denied review (Petitioner's App. E, at A17). Petitioner then sought a writ of mandamus from the Supreme Court of Kansas, directing the trial judge to reinstate the verdict (Respondents' App. 2, at A2). The Supreme Court of Kansas denied the petition for a writ of mandamus (Respondents' App. 1, at A1). On June 6, 1983, the Petition for Certiorari was docketed in this Court.

### **REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION**

The Petition for Certiorari should be denied for two reasons. The first is that no federal issue or question is raised by the petition because no cognizable property interest is at stake. The second reason for denying the petition is that no final judgment by the Kansas Supreme Court on the asserted federal issue has been rendered.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. THE PETITIONER WAS NOT DENIED DUE PROCESS OR DEPRIVED OF ANY PROPERTY RIGHT, BECAUSE STATE LAW DID NOT VEST PETITIONER WITH A PROPERTY RIGHT IN AN UNAFFIRMED JURY VERDICT.**

Petitioner urges jurisdiction before this Court based on 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) (1976). Petitioner asserts that the trial court's application of KAN. STAT. ANN. § 60-259 (a) (1976), which in part allows a trial judge to grant a new trial when a verdict is based on passion or prejudice or is outside the range of evidence, deprived him of a property right in the unaffirmed jury verdict. Because the state appellate courts refused to reinstate this verdict, the petitioner now urges this Court that he has been deprived of property without due process in violation of the fourteenth amendment.

In *Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564 (1972), the Court considered the fourteenth amendment procedural protection of property rights. What is "property" for the purposes of the fourteenth amendment is a matter of state law.

Property interests, of course, are not created by the Constitution. Rather, they are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules or understandings that stem from an independent source such as state law—rules are understandings that secure certain benefits and that support claims of entitlement to those benefits.

*Id.* at 577. See *Webb's Fabulous Pharmacies, Inc. v. Beckwith*, 449 U.S. 155, 161 (1980) (looking to Florida law to

find a property interest in the earnings of an interpleader fund).

Kansas law on what may constitute "property" in the framework of litigation is discussed in *Board of Greenwood County Commissioners v. Nadel*, 228 Kan. 469, 618 P.2d 778 (1980). In that case, a partnership successfully appealed an assessment of taxes by Greenwood County to the state board of tax appeals. Under an existing statutory provision, no appeal existed from the determination of the tax board. Subsequent legislation, however, retroactively granted the right of appeal to tax litigants. *Id.* at 470-72.

In determining whether a retroactive application of this statute would disturb a vested right in the tax board's determination, the Kansas Supreme Court noted:

Rights are vested when the right to enjoyment, present or prospective, has become the property of some particular person or persons as a present interest. On the other hand, a mere expectancy of future benefit, or a contingent interest in property founded on anticipated continuance of existing laws, does not constitute a vested right. [citation omitted] A vested right is a right so fixed that it is not dependent on any future act, contingency or decision to make it more secure, and a defendant in an action does not acquire a vested right in a judgment dismissing an appeal, but only an inchoate right which will become vested upon the happening of an affirmance by the appellate court by the expiration of the period allowed for appeal.

*Id.* at 473-74. The taxpayers in *Nadel* sought to preserve the tax board's determination by asserting a vested right in the decision. The court held there was no vested right.

In granting the rehearing in this case, this court merely exercised its power of control over pending litigation,

and this was before any final determination had been made. No judgment determining the rights of these litigants has yet passed beyond the control of this court. The cause is still pending and will continue to pend until the mandate goes down. The court, up to that time, has deprived the litigants of no vested right. When a judgment has been pronounced and has become final then and only then have the rights of the defendants been duly disturbed. There is no vested right in a judgment held by the party in whose favor it is rendered so as to preclude its re-examination and vacation in the ordinary modes of appeal provided by law. It is true in this case that this court had previously held that there was no right of appeal in these cases, but the court always has the right and the duty to re-examine its prior decisions.

*Id.* at 474.

In the present case, the petitioner had only an expectation that the jury's verdict would remain undisturbed. Although this case does not concern a retroactive application of a statute, the reasoning of the Kansas Supreme Court in *Nadel* is applicable in determining whether a property interest exists in an unaffirmed verdict that has yet to survive the procedural remedies and appeals that exist to a litigant. It is noteworthy that no final determination had been made in *Nadel* and, therefore, no vested right could exist. Similarly, in the present case, because the grant of a new trial is not a final order under Kansas procedure, *Brown v. Fitzpatrick*, 224 Kan. 636, 585 P.2d 987 (1978), a final determination had not been made to vest the petitioner with a property right. Therefore, the petitioner did not have a vested right in the untested jury verdict.

As the Court in *Roth* noted, "the Fourteenth Amendment's procedural protection of property is a safeguard of the security of interest that a person has already acquired in specific benefits." 408 U.S. at 576. The Court went on to note that property interests protected by procedural due process have certain attributes.

To have a property interest in a benefit, a person clearly must have more than an abstract need or desire for it. He must have more than a unilateral expectation of it. He must, instead, have a legitimate claim of entitlement to it. It is a purpose of the ancient institution of property to protect those claims upon which people rely in their daily lives, reliance that must not be arbitrarily undermined. It is a purpose of the constitutional right to a hearing to provide an opportunity for a person to vindicate those claims.

*Id.* at 577.

Essentially, the petitioner had no more than a unilateral expectation that the jury verdict would not be subjected to a remittitur or reversal on appeal. The only reliance interest that is created when a person files a lawsuit is that it will be fairly decided at a hearing.

In this case, the petitioner's claims were adjudicated fully at both the trial and appellate levels. The trial court exercised its discretion in ordering a remittitur or new trial, and the state appellate courts affirmed that order. Dissatisfied, the petitioner sought a second bite of the apple by seeking a writ of mandamus which was denied. Now the petitioner seeks a third bite by appealing to this Court. From the foregoing, it is apparent that the petitioner was not deprived of any property right because no property existed in the uncontested jury verdict as a matter of state law.

**II. A FINAL JUDGMENT ON A FEDERAL QUESTION HAS NOT BEEN RENDERED BY THE KANSAS SUPREME COURT WITHIN THE MEANING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1257.**

Jurisdiction before this Court to consider a writ of certiorari is predicated on a final judgment on a federal question by the highest court of a state. In *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469 (1975), the Court recognized 28 U.S.C. § 1257 as a restriction of its appellate jurisdiction on cases coming from the state courts.

The court has noted that “[c]onsiderations of English usage as well as those of judicial policy” would justify an interpretation of the final judgment rule to preclude review “where anything further remains to be determined by a State court, no matter how dissociated from the only federal issue that has finally been adjudicated by the highest court of the State.”

*Id.* at 477 (quoting *Radio Station WOW, Inc. v. Johnson*, 326 U.S. 120 (1945)).

The Court, however, recognized four categories of cases that were exceptions to this general rule. It further noted that in most of these categories, additional state proceedings would not require the decision of other federal questions that also might require review by the Court at a later date. *Id.* at 477. It is noteworthy that in all of these cases, there must be a state court decision on a federal issue before the Court will consider an appeal while state proceedings are pending. Obviously, in order for there to be a state adjudication on a federal issue the state courts necessarily must have considered that issue. The Kansas Supreme Court, however, only considered whether the order to grant a new trial had been issued properly. No constitutional issue had been raised in the normal ap-

pellate review below as to whether the petitioner had been denied due process or deprived of a property interest.

After the Kansas Supreme Court denied the petitioner's petition for review on the trial court's order for a new trial, the petitioner then sought a writ of mandamus in the Kansas Supreme Court to direct the trial court to do what the petitioner had failed to achieve in his petition for review. In his petition for a writ of mandamus, the petitioner raised for the first time the issue before this Court —that the trial court deprived the petitioner of property without due process by ordering a remittitur or new trial. Respondent can only assume that the Kansas Supreme Court did not consider these arguments for the reason that the petitioner improperly used a mandamus action as a substitute for an appeal already pursued. See *Gray v. Jenkins*, 183 Kan. 251, 254, 255, 326 P.2d 319 (1958) (holding that a writ of mandamus is not a substitute for appeal and may not issue in any case where there is a plain and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law).

Thus, it is apparent from the foregoing that the Kansas Supreme Court never ruled on the asserted federal issue that the petitioner now raises before this Court because it was not properly raised below.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should not exercise jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3).

## CONCLUSION

The petitioner has failed to assert a property interest sufficient to constitute a deprivation of property rights protected by the fourteenth amendment. Even if there is a property interest in an untested jury verdict, further state proceedings may obviate the necessity for a decision on the asserted federal issue at this time.

The petition for writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

BODDINGTON & BROWN  
By /s/ KENNETH J. REILLY

Security National Bank Building  
Suite 100  
Minnesota at 7th Street  
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX 1**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

No. 83-55734-S

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Appellant,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE R. CORNELL,  
Appellees.

**DENIAL OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

(Filed May 24, 1983)

You are hereby notified of the following action taken  
in the above entitled case:

Petition for a writ of mandamus.

Denied.

Yours very truly,

Lewis C. Carter,  
Clerk, Supreme Court

Dated June 3, 1983.

**APPENDIX 2**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE  
OF KANSAS

No. 83-55734-S

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
Appellant,

v.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE R. CORNELL,  
Appellees.

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR MANDAMUS**

Petitioner, Mark Hochanadel, respectfully petitions this Court to compel Respondent, The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr., to vacate such Respondent's Order of November 20, 1981 in the cause styled *Mark Hochanadel v. Detco Trailer, Inc. and Lawrence R. Cornell* No. 78-C-1323, and to reinstate the jury verdict for Petitioner in the amount of Eight Hundred Fifty-five Thousand (\$855,000.00) Dollars. That Order of November 20, 1981 directed a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial. Petitioner rejected such remittitur and a new trial was ordered. A pretrial conference has been scheduled for May 26, 1983 with respect to that new trial.

Petitioner further petitions this Court to compel Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. to stay all proceedings with regard to the new trial pending the outcome of this matter in mandamus; and requests that the disposition of this matter be expedited.

*Preliminary Statement*

In July, 1981 a jury trial was had on Petitioner's personal injury action against Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. in the District Court of Kansas for Wyandotte County in the cause styled *Mark Hochanadel v. Detco Trailer, Inc. and Lawrence R. Cornell*, No. 78-C-1323. The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr., Respondent herein, was presiding judge. Following that trial the jury returned a unanimous verdict in favor of Petitioner against Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. The jury assessed Petitioner's net recovery against those two Respondents at Eight Hundred Fifty-five Thousand (\$855,000.00) Dollars. Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. on July 24, 1981 entered a judgment on such verdict (see Exhibit "B" attached to Petition for Mandamus).

Subsequently, Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. made a Motion for New Trial, or in the Alternative, Motion for Remittitur. Such Motion was argued to the District Court on August 17, 1981 and on October 29, 1981 Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr., by memorandum decision, ordered a remittitur of the verdict to Three Hundred Sixty-seven Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty-eight and 50/100 (\$367,888.50) Dollars. Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. cited, as the basis for the remittitur ordered, his feeling that the verdict was outside the range of the evidence (see Exhibit "A" attached to the Petition for Mandamus).

On November 12, 1981 Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. moved to modify Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.'s memorandum decision of October 29, 1981 to reflect an alternative order for new trial if Petitioner rejected the remittitur. Petitioner then moved to strike Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco

Trailer, Inc.'s motion to modify, and to reinstate the verdict. Such motions were argued to the District Court on November 18, 1981. At that hearing Petitioner argued that Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. deprived Petitioner of property without due process of law by improperly ordering the remittitur. On November 20, 1981 Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. issued another order granting Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. a new trial in the event Petitioner rejected the remittitur, and finding that the jury was influenced by passion and prejudice. Thereafter, on December 11, 1981 Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. filed his Journal Entry of Judgment reflecting that Order of November 20, 1981 (see Exhibit "B" attached to Petition for Mandamus).

On November 25, 1981, Petitioner filed his original Notice of Appeal in the Court of Appeals of Kansas. Respondents Lawrence Cornell and Detco Trailer, Inc. filed their Notice of Cross-Appeal on December 11, 1981. Petitioner's refusal to accept remittitur was filed on December 21, 1981, as was Petitioner's Amended Notice of Appeal in the Court of Appeals of Kansas. Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. then ordered a new trial.

In his appellate brief Petitioner contended that Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. was without jurisdiction to enter his order directing a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial, in that said Respondent failed to comply with the substantive requirements of Kansas law, namely K.S.A. 60-259 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Kansas. The Court of Appeals of Kansas on December 30, 1982 dismissed Petitioner's appeal on the ground that Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr.'s order complied with Kansas law, was within his

jurisdiction, and was not appealable as of right (see Exhibit "C" attached to Petition for Mandamus).

Subsequently, on January 10, 1983 Petitioner made a Motion for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc before the Court of Appeals of Kansas. That Motion was denied on January 19, 1983. On January 31, 1983 Petitioner filed a Petition for Review in this Court requesting it to review the decision of the Court of Appeals of Kansas rendered on December 30, 1982. That Petition for Review was denied on March 8, 1983.

Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. has scheduled a pretrial conference, with respect to the new trial in this cause for May 26, 1983.

*Point Relied On*

THIS COURT SHOULD ISSUE AN ORDER IN MANDAMUS COMPELLING RESPONDENT THE HONORABLE CORDELL D. MEEKS, JR. TO VACATE HIS ORDER GRANTING A NEW TRIAL AND TO REINSTATE THE ORIGINAL VERDICT AND JUDGMENT THEREON, BECAUSE RESPONDENT THE HONORABLE CORDELL D. MEEKS, JR. ENTERED SUCH ORDER WITHOUT JURISDICTION THEREBY DEPRIVING PETITIONER OF PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW IN VIOLATION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS NO ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW BY APPEAL OR BY MANDAMUS IN A COURT OF PROPER CONCURRENT JURISDICTION, AND TO CORRECT THE ORDER OF RESPONDENT THE HONORABLE CORDELL D. MEEKS, JR. TO ASSURE THAT IT IS JUST, LEGAL, AND FREE OF ABUSE.

\* \* \*

B. *Violation of Due Process.*

As detailed above, by entering his Order directing a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial, Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. was acting as a thirteenth juror in excess of his jurisdiction. Petitioner has a property right in the jury verdict and judgment thereon which is protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. That clause provides that no state shall deprive a person of property without due process of law. Yet Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr. has done exactly that by directing a remittitur or in the alternative ordering a new trial while lacking jurisdiction to do so.

This clearly violates the due process requirement that Petitioner be given a meaningful opportunity to be heard. *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U. S. 371, 378, 98 Sup. Ct. 780, 785 (1971). Due process expresses the requirement of fundamental fairness. *Lassiter v. Department of Soc. Serv. of Durham Cty.*, 101 Sup. Ct. 2153, 2158 (1981). The United States Supreme Court traditionally has held that the due process clause protects civil litigants who seek recourse in the courts either as defendants hoping to protect their property or as plaintiffs attempting to redress grievances. *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 102 Sup. Ct. 1148, 1154 (1982). It is evident in this situation that Respondent The Honorable Cordell D. Meeks, Jr., by acting without jurisdiction in ordering a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial denied Petitioner a meaningful opportunity to be heard and was in violation of fundamental fairness.

\* \* \*

No. 82-1972

Office of the Clerk, U.S.  
SUPREME COURT  
FILED  
JUL 11 1983  
ALEXANDER L. STEVENS

In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1982

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Petitioner,*

vs.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE CORNELL.

**PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF TO PETITION FOR  
A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF  
APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS**

WILLIAM H. PICKETT  
*Counsel of Record*  
WILLIAM H. PICKETT, P.C.  
1413 Traders Bank Building  
1125 Grand Avenue  
Kansas City, Missouri 64106  
(816) 221-4343

and

MICHAEL E. CALLEN  
CALLEN, SEXTON, RAJALA & SHELOR  
410 Security National Bank Bldg.  
707 Minnesota Avenue  
Kansas City, Kansas 66101  
(913) 621-0202  
*Attorneys for Petitioner*

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether there is a protectible property interest in a jury verdict sufficient to raise a federal question under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3).
2. Whether this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) to consider an asserted federal question not explicitly the subject of a final judgment by the Supreme Court of Kansas.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Reasons for Granting the Petition ..... | 2 |
| Conclusion .....                        | 7 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <i>Board of Greenwood County Commissioners v. Nadel</i> ,<br>228 Kan. 469, 618 P.2d 778 (1980) .....                           | 2 |
| <i>Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth</i> , 408 U.S.<br>564, 92 S.Ct. 2701 (1972) .....                                | 2 |
| <i>Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Kohn</i> , 420 U.S. 469 (1974)  | 5 |
| <i>Herbel v. Endres</i> , 202 Kan. 733, 451 P.2d 184 (1969)  | 3 |
| <i>Landscape Development Company v. Kansas City<br/>Power &amp; Light Company</i> , 197 Kan. 126, 451 P.2d<br>398 (1966) ..... | 3 |
| <i>Mettee v. Urban Renewal Agency</i> , 219 Kan. 165, 557<br>P.2d 356 (1976) .....   | 3 |
| <i>Webb v. Webb</i> , 101 S.Ct. 1889 (1981) .....  | 6 |
| <i>Wood v. Georgia</i> , 101 S.Ct. 1097, 67 L.Ed.2d 220 (1981)   | 6 |

### Constitutional Provisions

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Fourteenth Amendment, United States Constitution .... | 2, 5 |
|---|------|

### Statutes

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| 28 U.S.C. § 1257 .....          | 4, 5, 6, 7 |
| Kan. Stat. Ann. 60-259(a) ..... | 3          |

No. 82-1972

---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1982

---

MARK HOCHANADEL,  
*Petitioner,*

vs.

DETCO TRAILER, INC., and  
LAWRENCE CORNELL.

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF TO PETITION FOR  
A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF  
APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS**

---

William H. Pickett, on behalf of Mark Hochanadel, submits Petitioner's Reply Brief to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kansas.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

### **I. Petitioner Was Denied Property Without Due Process of Law, Because State Law Did Not Vest Petitioner With a Protectible Property Interest in the Jury Verdict.**

Petitioner acknowledges that under *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 92 S.Ct. 2701 (1972), what is "property" for the purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause can be a matter of state law. However, "[t]he Court has also made clear that the property interests protected by procedural due process extend well beyond actual ownership of real estate, chattels, or money." *Id.* at 572-73, 2706 (footnote omitted).

Respondents cite *Board of Greenwood County Commissioners v. Nadel*, 228 Kan. 469, 618 P.2d 778 (1980), in support of their proposition that petitioner had no property right in the jury verdict at issue sufficient to warrant Fourteenth Amendment protection. Such reliance on that case is unfounded. That case dealt only with the retroactive application of a statute as disturbing a tax board determination, and involved "vested property rights." *Board of Regents* does not require that property rights be "vested" before coming under Fourteenth Amendment due process protection; it instead refers only to a security of interests acquired in specific benefits as "property." *Id.* at 577, 2708.

Nevertheless, petitioner in the present case had more than a mere expectation that the jury verdict would remain undisturbed. Petitioner had a legitimate expectation that the jury verdict would not be disturbed and new trial granted other than on the exclusive grounds

stated in Kan. Stat. Ann. 60-259(a). Further, petitioner had a legitimate expectation that any new trial granted on such grounds would be supported with specific reasons. *Mettee v. Urban Renewal Agency*, 219 Kan. 165, 557 P.2d 356 (1976); *Herbel v. Endres*, 202 Kan. 733, 451 P.2d 184 (1969); and *Landscape Development Company v. Kansas City Power & Light Company*, 197 Kan. 126, 451 P.2d 398 (1966).

Petitioner had a legitimate claim of entitlement to the verdict, which could be disturbed only by the court acting within its jurisdiction. Yet, as already described in the Petition, that entitlement was indeed disturbed by the court acting without its jurisdiction. Such lack of jurisdiction results from the evidence that the trial court actually granted respondents a new trial because it was dissatisfied with the verdict, and not because of any of the exclusive statutory grounds, and from the fact that it failed to support its purported reasons with specificity.

Contrary to respondents' assertion, petitioner did have more than a unilateral expectation that the jury verdict would not be subjected to remittitur or reversal on appeal. Petitioner had a lawful expectation that the jury verdict would not be subjected to a remittitur or reversed on appeal, other than by a court acting within its jurisdiction. Respondents state in their Brief that the only reliance interest that is created when a person files a lawsuit is that it will be fairly decided at a hearing. Petitioner respectfully submits that such reliance interest in the present case has been arbitrarily undermined by the Kansas courts' failure to fairly decide petitioner's suit. Lack of fairness is evident from lack of jurisdiction.

Petitioner does not deny that in this case his claims were adjudicated fully at both the trial and appellate levels. What petitioner does assert, however, is that such claims were not adjudicated *fairly* at both the trial and appellate levels. Lack of fairness is evidenced by the fact that trial court's Order of Remittitur, or in the Alternative, a New Trial contradicted its findings, the evidence, and Kansas law. As a result the trial court was clearly without jurisdiction to order petitioner to accept a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial. Such order was entered simply because the trial court was dissatisfied with the verdict, and such order is arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious.

Therefore, petitioner asserts that there is a protectible property interest in the jury verdict sufficient to raise a federal question under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3). Essentially the property interest arises from petitioner's right not to have such jury verdict disturbed except by a court acting in accord with Kansas law. The recognition of such property interest under Kansas law is apparent from the existence of the Kansas statute cited above which limits the grant of a new trial to specified grounds, and from the Kansas Supreme Court decisions cited above which have reversed the grant of a new trial where the new trial was granted for reasons not within the exclusive grounds provided by the new trial statute.

## **II. This Court Has Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) to Consider the Federal Question.**

The decision of the Court of Appeals of Kansas in this case is a "final judgment or decree" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1257. Such a decision was plainly final on the federal issue of whether the trial court de-

prived petitioner of property without due process of law, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, by ordering a remittitur or in the alternative a new trial while lacking jurisdiction to do so.

It is evident that nothing further remains to be determined by the Kansas courts on this issue of the trial court's jurisdiction to order a remittitur or in the alternative grant a new trial. Nevertheless, should this Court find that a final judgment has not been rendered in this case, the decision on the federal question should be treated as a final judgment for the purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1257. Any additional proceedings in the Kansas courts will not require the decision of other federal questions that might also require review by the Court at a later date, and immediate rather than delayed review is the best way to avoid the mischief of economic waste and of delayed justice. *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Kohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 477-478 (1974). In this case the federal issue will not be mooted or otherwise affected by any proceedings yet to be had because they are wholly unrelated to the federal question.

Respondents further contend that in order for there to be a state adjudication on the federal issue, the state courts necessarily must have considered that issue. Petitioner has already asserted that the federal issue was raised first before the trial court, and that both the Court of Appeals of Kansas and the Supreme Court of Kansas implicitly ruled upon such issue by dismissal of plaintiff's appeal and denial of *review of that dismissal*. Regardless, even if this Court holds that petitioner failed to adequately raise his federal constitutional challenge in the Kansas courts, this Court has jurisdiction to review plain error unchallenged in the state courts to prevent fundamental

unfairness as exists here. *See Webb v. Webb*, 101 S.Ct. 1889, 1895 (1981), and *Wood v. Georgia*, 101 S.Ct. 1097, 1100 n.5, 67 L.Ed.2d 220 (1981).

Petitioner further disputes respondents' contention that petitioner in his Petition for Writ of Mandamus raised for the first time the issue before this Court—that the trial court deprived the petitioner of property without due process by ordering a remittitur or new trial. Such is not the case; that issue was raised before the trial court.

Therefore, for the above and foregoing reasons, this Court should exercise jurisdiction, under 28 U.S.C. § 1257 (3), over the final judgment of the Court of Appeals of Kansas regarding petitioner's due process rights in the jury verdict and judgment thereon.

## CONCLUSION

Petitioner has adequately asserted a property interest cognizable as a property right protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(3) to consider the federal question asserted by petitioner herein.

The Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM H. PICKETT

*Counsel of Record*

WILLIAM H. PICKETT, P.C.

1413 Traders Bank Building

1125 Grand Avenue

Kansas City, Missouri 64106

(816) 221-4343

and

MICHAEL E. CALLEN

CALLEN, SEXTON, RAJALA & SHELOR

410 Security National Bank Bldg.

707 Minnesota Avenue

Kansas City, Kansas 66101

(913) 621-0202

*Attorneys for Petitioner*